

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 2, and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Bridgelall, US Patent 6,895,255. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Bridgelall reference teaches an arrangement where a dual mode unit – that is, a unit that is capable of operating in either the 802.11 protocol or the Bluetooth protocol sends a message in the 803.22 protocol -- reserves a transmission time interval for the purposes of operating under the Bluetooth protocol. It does so by spoofing other units into believing that the dual mode unit is busy communicating by use of the 802.11 protocol where, in reality, it reserves the medium for communication by means of the Bluetooth protocol.

In the subject claims, in contradistinction, the focus is on the address employed by the station that sends out the message, and it is independent of whether the unit that sends the message is a dual mode unit or a single mode unit. The claims are also not related to any desire on the part of the unit that sends out the message to itself employ the transmission medium. Specifically, the subject claims are directed to the issue of a station recognizing that the message it receives has an address that is borrowed from another protocol, and acting on the base of this recognition. It is respectfully submitted that the step of sending specified in both claim 1 and claim 11 is not found anywhere in the reference.

Referring to claim 1 specifically, it is noted that, among others, claim 1 specifies a step of sending a signal containing a duration value to an address “already in use by a second standard.” What that means is that claim 1 specifies a method that effectively employs **two**-level spoofing. In the first level, the signal that is sent includes a duration value that is “other than a time period for a predetermined subsequent message transmission.” In the second level, the signal is sent to an address that belongs to a second standard.

The Examiner asserts that this is taught by Bridgelall, and in support of this assertion the Examiner points to col. 5, lines 20-29. However, applicant believes that the cited passage does not teach the above-mentioned second level spoofing and, therefore, does not support the Examiner’s position.

The cited passage states:

In order to provide a window for operation under the Bluetooth protocol, dual mode mobile unit 10 sends a request to send (RTS) signal 70 to access point 102. Access point 102 acknowledges with a clear to send (CTS) signal 72 providing a time interval for operation of a transmission from dual mode mobile unit 10. The CTS signal causes other mobile units, MU-a and MU-b, to set their network allocation vector (NAV) to a value indicating that the network will be busy during the transmission time requested by the dual mode mobile unit 10. The dual mode mobile unit 10 thereafter sends a short frame 802.11 message 74.

It is clear that the above teaches spoofing by sending a packet with a duration that is longer than that which is necessary to send the short 802.11 message (the first level of spoofing mentioned above). However, there is simply no mention at all of the address to which the RTS message and the 802.11 message are sent. Therefore one cannot assert that the reference teaches using an address that is "already in use by a second standard," as claim 1 specifies. Moreover, it is believed that claim 1 is also not obvious in view of Bridgelall because the entire notion of using an address of a second protocol to signal stations of a first protocol is totally absent from the reference.

Claims 2 and 5 are not anticipated by the Bridgelall reference because they depend on claim 1.

Claims 3, 6-13 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bridgelall. It is noted that among the rejected claims is claim 11, which is an independent claim. It is believed that claim 11, which in some sense parallels claim 1, is neither anticipated nor is obvious in view of Bridgelall reference for the reasons expressed in connection with claim 1, and the remaining claims 1, 6-10, 12-13 and 15 are not obvious in view of Bridgelall at least per force of their dependence on claims 1 or 11.

Claims 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bridgelall in view of Tzeng, US Patent Application Publication 2005/0122825.


Applicant respectfully traverses, believing that claims 4 and 14 are not obvious in view of the Bridgelall and Tzeng combination of references at least per force of their dependence on claims 1 and 11.

New claims 16-18 are believed to be allowable in light of the known prior art.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants believe that all of the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Dated: 3/21/06

Respectfully,
Matthew J. Sherman

By 

Henry T. Brendzel

Reg. No. 26,844

Phone (973) 467-2025

Fax (973) 467-6589

email brendzel@comcast.net